

1 Thomas R. Burke (CA State Bar No. 141930)
2 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
3 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
4 San Francisco, California 94111
5 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
6 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599
7 Email: thomasburke@dwt.com

8 Matt Zimmerman (CA State Bar No. 212423)
9 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
10 454 Shotwell Street
11 San Francisco, California 94110
12 Telephone: (415) 436-9333
13 Facsimile: (415) 436-9993
14 Email: mattz@eff.org

15 Attorneys for Defendants
16 COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC
17 RELATIONS, INC., COUNCIL ON AMERICAN
18 ISLAMIC RELATIONS ACTION NETWORK, INC.,
19 AND COUNCIL ON AMERICAN ISLAMIC
20 RELATIONS OF SANTA CLARA, INC.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Unable to raise a valid argument in opposition to CAIR's fee motion, Michael Savage
 3 instead offers yet another inflammatory screed aimed not at illuminating any material issue but
 4 instead at clouding the only matter before this Court: applying the appropriate legal standard for
 5 evaluating attorney fee applications under 17 U.S.C. § 505. On that issue, Savage has nothing to
 6 say. He offers no substantive argument regarding CAIR's entitlement to a fee award, and he does
 7 not dispute the reasonableness of the fees sought or the hourly rates or time incurred by CAIR's
 8 counsel.

9 Instead, Savage continues to misuse the Court's docket to level groundless accusations
 10 against CAIR while hiding behind the litigation privilege. For example, no longer content to
 11 shamelessly toss around terms like "terrorist" and "terrorism," Savage now argues that it would be
 12 a "reasonable interpretation of the law" to hold that CAIR's public criticism of his radio program
 13 is akin to "cross burning." Opposition at pp. 10-11. In addition, according to his "Third Amended
 14 Complaint," Savage now argues that CAIR's public criticism of Savage's radio program somehow
 15 amounts to *extortion*. Exhibit 1 to Declaration of Daniel A. Horowitz in Opposition to CAIR's
 16 Motion for Attorneys' Fees ("Horowitz Decl.") at ¶¶ 13-17, 81, 90-91, 95, 641-643. As with his
 17 previous filings, Savage's Opposition appears more tailored to be fodder for his national radio
 18 program than to press any legitimate legal point. With every filing, Savage offers yet more
 19 unreasonable and frivolous behavior, factors that further favor CAIR and its Motion. *See, e.g.,*
 20 *Perfect 10, Inc. v CCBill, LLC*, 488 F.3d 1102, 1120 (9th Cir. 2007) (requiring the court to
 21 consider the objective unreasonableness of a party's claims, "both in the factual and in the legal
 22 components of the case.").

23 As the Court noted in its Order of July 25, 2008, which summarily dismissed Savage's
 24 claims, "the gravamen of plaintiff's dispute is with the ideas that defendants may or may not
 25 espouse." Order at p. 14. For all of his protests and attempts to recast this frivolous litigation in a
 26 more favorable light in order to evade a fee award, Savage's position remains the same today.
 27 Distilled to its essence, Savage argues in his Opposition that (1) Savage *could* have won had he
 28 wanted to (though he openly concedes that he lost), and (2) in any case, the positions taken by

1 Savage – which were unequivocally and correctly rejected by the Court – were in fact “close calls”
 2 which should result in a denial of fees to CAIR. As neither argument has merit or even remotely
 3 addresses the applicable fee standard, CAIR’s Motion should be granted in full.

4

5 **II. ARGUMENT**

6 **A. Savage Challenges Neither CAIR’s Attorneys’ Rates Nor Their Submitted**
 7 **Hours.**

8 Savage challenges neither the appropriateness of CAIR’s attorneys’ rates nor their hours
 9 expended on the successful defense of this litigation. Aside from nakedly stating that the Court
 10 should not award any fees at all, Savage introduces neither argument nor evidence in support of
 11 his position. *See, e.g., Fed’n of Fly Fishers v. Daley*, 200 F. Supp. 2d 1181, 1193 (N.D. Cal. 2002)
 12 (granting full requested fee amount where “defendants submit no factual evidence in opposition to
 13 the proposed fee. ... Based on the evidence before it, the Court determines that [the proposed]
 14 hourly rate ... is reasonable.”); *Jobete Music Co., Inc. v. Media Broadcasting Corp.*, 713 F. Supp.
 15 174, 180 (M.D.N.C. 1988) (awarding the full fees sought under 17 U.S.C. § 505 by the moving
 16 party, noting that “Defendants have submitted no evidence disputing this fee nor any evidence
 17 possibly mitigating against an award of attorney’s fees and costs.”). Offering the Court no basis to
 18 contradict the evidence submitted by CAIR in support of its Motion, Savage effectively concedes
 19 the second step of the Ninth Circuit’s two-part copyright attorneys’ fees standard.

20 Savage would in fact be hard-pressed to argue that the rates submitted or amount sought by
 21 CAIR are excessive as he has publicly confirmed that his own fees for the same litigation far
 22 exceed those sought by CAIR. *See* Exhibit G to Declaration of Matthew Zimmerman of August
 23 29, 2008 (Docket No. 42) (April 4, 2008, posting on Savage’s website noting that the legal cost of
 24 this case “thus far” “is about \$150,000” and that donations from his audience had “gotten us this
 25 far”);¹ Exhibit 1 to Supplemental Declaration of Matthew Zimmerman of October 31, 2008

26 ¹ “IMPORTANT NOTICE TO MY DEAR SUPPORTERS: Thus far, the legal cost is about
 27 \$150,000! This is only first base on the long road of this important First-Amendment case.
 28 Contrary to what some believe, this case is NOT – I repeat NOT – being represented pro-bono.
 Your donations have gotten us this far, and with your continued support, we will fight for our
 freedom of speech all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, if necessary. Thank you, Michael
 Savage.”

(“Supplemental Zimmerman Decl.”) (September 18, 2008, website notice stating that Savage’s legal costs associated with this litigation are now “over \$250,000.”).² *See also* Exhibit 1 to Horowitz Decl. at ¶ 13 (“Michael Savage has incurred costs and attorney’s fees in order to protect is [sic] property both tangible and intangible from damage by the Hobbs Act extortion(s) of CAIR. The losses are in excess of \$200,000 and are continuing.”).³

In any case, as pointed out in CAIR’s opening brief, the billable rates of its attorneys are reasonable and well within the prevailing hourly rates in the San Francisco Bay Area for lawyers of comparable education, expertise, and experience who handle matters of the type involved in this litigation, a fact confirmed by a wide range of courts in recent years. *See Declaration of Daralyn Durie in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Award of Attorneys’ Fees* (Docket No. 44) at ¶ 7; *Declaration of Thomas R. Burke in Support of Defendants’ Motion for Award of Attorneys’ Fees* (Docket No. 48) at ¶ 6. *See also* CAIR’s Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of its Motion for Attorneys’ Fees at pp. 11-13. Savage makes no assertion and offers no evidence to the contrary.

B. Savage Does Not Materially Challenge CAIR’s Argument and Supporting Evidence That a Fee Award Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505 Is Appropriate.

In addition to failing to offer any argument against the specific fees sought by CAIR, Savage does not materially challenge the application of the relevant 17 U.S.C. § 505 factors weighed in the Ninth Circuit to determine whether fees should be rewarded at all. *See, e.g., Wall Data Inc. v. Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Dept.*, 447 F.3d 769, 787 (9th Cir. 2006) (factors the district court may consider include “(1) the degree of success obtained, (2) frivolousness, (3) motivation, (4) reasonableness of losing party’s legal and factual arguments, and (5) the need to

² “Thank you again to all of you who have contributed to continue the fight for free speech. As you may know, I was forced to drop my lawsuit against CAIR for non-legal reasons. Unfortunately after spending over \$250,000, I discovered the legal system is stacked against patriots and favors even those who are unindicted co-conspirators in a federal anti-terrorism trial.”

³ Savage’s counsel filed a declaration in opposition to CAIR’s fee motion asserting that his fees for this litigation amounted to only \$30,000, in sharp contrast to the \$250,000 that his client publicly represented had been spent to date in legal fees on this matter. *See Horowitz Decl.* at ¶ 10. As Mr. Horowitz has only attested to his own fees and not to all legal fees spent by Savage for purposes of this litigation, CAIR will assume that the much larger amounts that Savage repeatedly identified in his fundraising appeals on his radio program and on his website, as well as in his “Third Amended Complaint,” were in fact accurate.

1 advance considerations of compensation and deterrence.”). Instead, he appears to argue (1) that
2 despite not challenging the Court’s Order of July 25, 2008, he *would* have won had he moved for
3 reconsideration, filed yet another amended complaint, or appealed; and (2) that his arguments
4 were not frivolous because, despite binding precedent to the contrary, a chance existed that the
5 Court *might* have ruled in his favor. Neither of these arguments is correct, let alone remotely
6 relevant.

7 First, as discussed fully in its fee motion, CAIR unequivocally won. Savage’s case was
8 dismissed in its entirety at the pleadings stage (with prejudice) after the Court dismissed his
9 copyright infringement claim and after Savage failed to submit an amended complaint attempting
10 to remedy the multiple fatal shortcomings in his RICO claim. To the extent that a complete
11 dismissal informs a court’s fee decision, it weighs solely in favor of the victorious party. *See, e.g.*,
12 *Smith v. Jackson*, 84 F.3d 1213, 1221 (9th Cir. 1996) (court to consider “degree of success
13 obtained”); *Fantasy, Inc. v. Fogerty*, 94 F.3d 553, 559 (9th Cir. 1996) (“*Fogerty II*”) (upholding
14 defendant’s award of \$1,347,519.15 in attorney’s fees under 17 U.S.C. § 505 where the
15 defendant’s “degree of success obtained” was complete); *Jackson v. Sturkie*, 255 F. Supp. 2d
16 1096, 1104 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (finding the plaintiff’s success to be “complete and unquestioned”
17 and an “award of attorneys’ fees appropriate.”). Savage had ample opportunity to craft and defend
18 valid causes of action if any existed in his initial Complaint, his First Amended Complaint, his
19 Second Amended Complaint, in his opposition to CAIR’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings,
20 and at oral argument. Savage was instead unable to do so because the fundamental premise of his
21 case was fatally and irredeemably flawed.

22 Second, despite the fact that his unfiled “Third Amended Complaint” is wholly irrelevant
23 to the Court’s evaluation of CAIR’s fee motion, this hypothetical Complaint would *not* have cured
24 the fundamental flaws identified by the Court. While he dwells at length on “new evidence”
25 allegedly tying CAIR to Hamas, Savage’s attached exhibit would once again fail to address the
26 shortcomings identified in the Court’s Order even if it was appropriately before the Court, such as
27 the fact that Savage’s alleged injury “is entirely focused upon defendants’ speech-related
28

1 activities” and that “plaintiff lacks standing to bring his civil RICO claim and has failed to allege
 2 proximate cause.” *See, e.g.*, Order at pp. 17, 19.

3 Third, Savage’s only attempt to address any of the relevant fee factors identified in CAIR’s
 4 opening brief – that his argument was not frivolous – is similarly unpersuasive. As the Court
 5 repeatedly pointed out in its Opinion, Savage did not raise any novel or unsettled question of law.
 6 Far from it. Indeed, the Court repeatedly noted that Savage’s arguments had been “squarely
 7 rejected by the Supreme Court” or otherwise precluded by controlling law. Order at p. 12.⁴

8 Even if Savage’s arguments were not objectively “frivolous” (though they are), this gains
 9 him little. Frivolity is merely one of several factors that the Court may use to evaluate the central
 10 objective identified by the Ninth Circuit; instead, “[f]aithfulness [of considered factors] to the
 11 purposes of the Copyright Act is . . . the pivotal criterion.” *Fogerty II*, 94 F.3d at 558. As the
 12 Ninth Circuit has pointed out, “‘exceptional circumstances’ are not a prerequisite to an award of
 13 attorneys fees; district courts may freely award fees, as long as they treat prevailing plaintiffs and
 14 prevailing defendants alike and seek to promote the Copyright Act’s objectives.” *Historical
 15 Research v. Cabral*, 80 F.3d 377, 378 (9th Cir. 1996). Both the Supreme Court and the Ninth
 16 Circuit have repeatedly held that a successful fair use defense promotes those objectives. *See, e.g.*,
 17 *Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 517, 527 (1994) (“*Fogerty I*”) (“[I]t is peculiarly important that
 18 the boundaries of copyright law be demarcated as clearly as possible.”); *Los Angeles News Service
 19 v. Reuters Television Intern., Ltd.*, 149 F.3d 987, 997 (9th Cir. 1998) (a successful fair use defense
 20 “serve[s] the purposes of the Copyright Act” and warrants an award of fees under 17 U.S.C. §
 21 505.).

22 ⁴ *See also, e.g.*, Order at p. 7 (“Plaintiff tries to conflate ‘motive’ with the purpose and character of
 23 the use, which is not permitted by the case law.”); *Id.* (“Plaintiff places primary reliance on the
 24 Supreme Court’s reasoning in *Harper and Row*, but it does not go so far as plaintiff contends.”);
 25 Order at p. 15 (“[T]he Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit have made clear that the First
 26 Amendment may be used as a shield to protect those engaged in ‘petitioning’ in the form of civil
 27 lawsuits and pre-litigation demand letters.”); Order at p. 17 (“Plaintiff’s complaint appears to raise
 28 precisely the First Amendment problems in the RICO context recognized by Justices Souter and
 Kennedy and the Third Circuit.”); Order at p. 19 (“[T]he Court finds that plaintiff’s Second
 Amended Complaint is similar to the complaint at issue in *Pelletier v. Zweifel*, 921 F.2d 1465,
 1518-19 (11th Cir. 1991), in which the Eleventh Circuit affirmed the district court’s dismissal of a
 RICO claim because it was brought to harass the defendant and constituted ‘shotgun’ pleadings
 that made it extremely difficult for the court and opposing parties to identify the facts that would
 give rise to a cognizable claim.”).

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 Fourth, the inability of the parties to settle this matter on terms of Savage’s liking is wholly
 2 immaterial to an evaluation of CAIR’s fee motion. The notion that it was somehow incumbent on
 3 the *Defendants* to actively seek settlement of frivolous claims with a Plaintiff who repeatedly
 4 smeared them on his nationally-syndicated radio program and in court filings as “terrorists” is
 5 absurd. Indeed, Savage even asserts that CAIR should have engaged with him to “discuss a
 6 resolution of this case *before filing.*” Opposition at p.1 (emphasis added). CAIR had no
 7 obligation to reach settlement with a litigant intent on pursuing an obvious public propaganda
 8 agenda or to in any way compromise CAIR’s clear legal rights. *See, e.g., Moore v. Southtrust*
 9 *Corp.*, 392 F. Supp. 2d 724, 735 (E.D. Va. 2005) (“The plaintiff now claims that . . . the defendant
 10 could have avoided a large portion of the attorney’s fees if the defendant had simply settled the
 11 case. However, the defendant was under no obligation to settle the plaintiff’s fraudulent claims,
 12 and thus, encourage others to file such fraudulent claims in the future.”).

13 The continued misrepresentations of Mr. Horowitz, and now Mr. Boyd, are unfortunate as
 14 they erroneously allege that CAIR’s counsel failed to satisfy its meet-and-confer obligations.
 15 Counsel did in fact meet and confer with Mr. Boyd regarding CAIR’s fee motion, a conversation
 16 that confirmed that there was little reason to believe that further conversations would be anything
 17 but a waste of time. *See* Zimmerman Supplemental Decl. at ¶¶ 3-4. Even if counsel had not met
 18 and conferred, however, Savage’s ongoing behavior only underscores the futility of such an
 19 exercise. Beyond the unending public slurs, Savage argues in his Opposition that CAIR is entitled
 20 to *no* fees (*see, e.g.*, Opposition at p. 25), but his counsel suggests, incredibly, that Savage was
 21 prepared to make a “sizable donation” to CAIR co-counsel EFF, apparently in the hopes that this
 22 would cause EFF to encourage CAIR to settle. Horowitz Decl. at ¶ 22. As if it needed to be
 23 stated, fee awards under 17 U.S.C. § 505 are made to prevailing parties,⁵ not counsel,⁶ and it

24 ⁵ *See* 17 U.S.C. § 505 (“[T]he court in its discretion may . . . award a reasonable attorney’s fee to
 25 the prevailing party as part of the costs.” (emphasis added)).

26 ⁶ *See, e.g., Evans v. Jeff D.*, 475 U.S. 717, 730 (1986) (holding that in enacting a “prevailing
 27 party” standard, Congress did not “bestow[] fee awards upon attorneys....”); *Venegas v. Mitchell*,
 495 U.S. 82, 87, 88 (1990) (“[I]t is the party, rather than the lawyer, who is so eligible [for a
 28 prevailing party fee award] . . . ”) (citing *Evans v. Jeff D.*, 475 U.S. at 730); *Pony v. County of Los
 Angeles*, 433 F.3d 1138, 1146 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that “prevailing party” attorneys’ fees
 [under 42 U.S.C. § 1988] “belong[] to clients, not to attorneys” (citing *Evans v. Jeff D.*, 475 U.S.
 at 730).”)

would be improper for counsel to even consider such a suggestion.⁷ See, e.g., *May v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 2005 WL 839291 at *1 (N.D. Cal. April 7, 2005) (granting plaintiff's motion for attorneys' fees where the defendant opposed the motion on the basis that plaintiff's counsel did not meet and confer pursuant to Local Rule 54-6(b) but where the plaintiff's surreply suggested that complying with meet and confer requirement would be futile); *Yue v. Storage Technology Corp.*, 2008 WL 4185835 at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2008) ("The Court finds that Judge Laporte properly considered Plaintiff's contentions and her finding that the meet and confer conference would have been futile so as to not warrant striking Defendants' motion for fees is consistent with the Court's interpretation of Civil Local Rule 54-6(b).").

C. Since This Court's Order Affirming CAIR's Fair Use of Savage Radio Show Excerpts, Savage Has Continued His Attempts To Misuse Copyright Law to Silence Online Critics Who Posted and Criticized the Same Material.

If Savage's own arguments and behavior in this case do not adequately illustrate the need to award fees as a deterrent against future abuse, his behavior since the Court's July 25th Order should. According to a complaint filed in this district by Plaintiff Brave New Films, on September 29, 2008 – 66 days after the Court dismissed Savage's copyright infringement claim with prejudice and 46 days after the entry of final judgment in this case – counsel for the Original Talk Radio Network ("OTRN," the syndicator for Savage's radio program) sent a baseless DMCA takedown notice⁸ demanding that online video site YouTube remove a video utilizing for purposes of criticism and commentary *the same copyrighted material* that this Court found to be protected by the fair use doctrine in this case. See Exhibit 2 to Supplemental Zimmerman Decl. (*Brave New Films v. Savage* Complaint (Case No. CV08-04703 JL)) at ¶¶ 22, 23; Exhibit 3 to Supplemental

⁷ See, e.g., *Cal Pak Delivery, Inc. v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, 60 Cal. Rptr. 2d 207, 209 (Cal. Ct. App. 1997) ("In this case we determine whether the trial court abused its discretion in disqualifying [Plaintiff's counsel] where [he] admitted he had offered to sell out his client and the class which the client was seeking to represent for a payment to himself personally of approximately \$8 to \$10 million. We believe that to state the question is to answer it."). See also California Rule of Professional Conduct 1-120 ("A member shall not knowingly assist in, solicit, or induce any violation of these rules or the State Bar Act.").

⁸ The September 29, 2008, DMCA takedown notice issued by Original Talk Radio Network to YouTube notes that "OTRN does not, by this letter, disclaim, release or speak for the separate rights of Michael Savage" but does not disclaim a role by Savage in sending the baseless notice. Even if Savage played no direct role, this latest abusive legal filing further demonstrates the pattern of Savage and his proxies (see CAIR's Motion for Attorneys' Fees at p. 10) of initiating groundless legal processes targeting First Amendment protected speech critical of Savage.

1 Zimmerman Decl. (OTRN DMCA takedown notice of September 29, 2008). This latest
 2 bewildering attempt to ignore the dictates of copyright law – and to flaunt the Court’s fair use
 3 findings here – underscores the compelling need to deter Savage and those acting in his interest
 4 from future abuses.⁹

5 **D. Savage’s Immaterial and Inflammatory Exhibits Should be Stricken From the**
Record.

6 Savage’s Opposition rests almost entirely on an attempt to reargue positions that the Court
 7 rejected. By definition, the exhibits he filed in opposition to CAIR’s Motion for this purpose are
 8 “redundant,” “immaterial,” and “impertinent.” *See* Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f).
 9 Moreover, by filing this irrelevant and offensive material, Savage continues his pattern of abusing
 10 this privileged forum to make false and inflammatory statements to serve interests outside the
 11 courtroom. The exhibits to Savage’s Opposition, having no bearing on this litigation, should be
 12 stricken from the record.

13
 14 **III. CONCLUSION**

15 CAIR completely prevailed against Michael Savage’s frivolous claims that targeted
 16 CAIR’s First Amendment-protected speech. CAIR has met the legal standard for the awarding of
 17 attorneys’ fees to prevailing parties pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505, a standard that is not in dispute.
 18 CAIR’s costs and fees prior to the filing of this Reply, as documented in its fees Motion, amount
 19 to \$189,898.10. The additional fees accrued for purposes of reviewing Savage’s Opposition and
 20 its voluminous attachments and drafting this Reply amount to \$15,160. In total, CAIR seeks
 21 \$205,058.10 in fees and costs. CAIR respectfully urges this Court to grant its Motion in full so
 22 that it will be fully compensated for its fees and costs associated with the successful defense of

23
 24 _____
 25 ⁹ The DMCA misuse lawsuit filed against Savage’s syndicator raises an additional troubling
 26 question: did Savage even have the right to file *this* lawsuit? According to the DMCA takedown
 27 notice issued to YouTube on September 29, 2008, he apparently did not. In this notice, OTRN’s
 28 counsel writes “[U]nder penalty of perjury, I state that this office represents the owner of an
 exclusive right infringed by the specified material,” including the copyrighted excerpts that
 Savage sued upon here. *See* Exhibit 3 to Supplemental Zimmerman Decl. If Mr. Glahn’s
 statement made under penalty of perjury is true, only OTRN (and not Savage) is legally entitled to
 “initiate legal action” alleging copyright infringement regarding the copyrighted material in
 question.

1 this case and to deter Michael Savage from future baseless attempts to abridge CAIR's First
2 Amendment rights.

3
4 DATED this 31st day of October, 2008.
5
6

7 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
8 Thomas R. Burke
9
10

11 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
12 Matthew J. Zimmerman
13
14

15 By: /s/ Matthew Zimmerman
16 Matthew J. Zimmerman
17
18

19 Attorneys for Defendants
20 COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC
21 RELATIONS, INC., COUNCIL ON AMERICAN
22 ISLAMIC RELATIONS ACTION NETWORK,
23 INC., AND COUNCIL ON AMERICAN ISLAMIC
24 RELATIONS OF SANTA CLARA, INC.
25
26
27
28

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP